



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,060	06/28/2003	Tong Zhang	BP 2859	6862

34399 7590 04/20/2006

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON LLP
P.O. BOX 160727
AUSTIN, TX 78716-0727

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/609,060	Applicant(s) ZHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Tanh Q. Nguyen	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/06/06 (RCE and amendment).
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-24 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 6, 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 13-14 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 13-14 and 20-21 contain the trademark/trade name Bluetooth and USB operating/interface standard. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the

Art Unit: 2182

goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. The trademark/trade name or the so-called standard/specification are subject to modifications by their owners and do not have fixed meaning; therefore the metes and bounds of the claims are claims indefinite.

Correction/clarification required.

The following rejections are made based on the examiner's best interpretation of the claims in light of the 35 USC 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 11, 15, 17-18, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by in view of Junod et al. (US 5,854,621).
4. Claims 11 and 18, Junod discloses a computer system having a host computer 30, at least one wireless user input device 10, and a host side wireless interface 20 (Fig 6). The host side wireless interface 20 has a host interface 610, a processing unit 600, a non-volatile memory 620 and wireless network interface 640-700 for interfacing with the at least one wireless input device; wherein during a configuration operation,

Art Unit: 2182

configuration information corresponding to the wireless user input is stored in the non-volatile memory (col. 7, l. 31 to col. 8, l. 28, col. 9, ll. 12-15) and also transferred to the host computer via the host interface (col. 9, ll. 15-25), wherein during a subsequent boot mode operations, the configuration information is retrieved from the non-volatile memory and used in servicing the user input device (col. 9, ll. 24-26).

5. Claims 15 and 22, Junod discloses the wireless input device including one of wireless mouse, keyboard or game controller (col. 2, ll. 6-22).

6. Claims 17 and 24, Junod discloses the information includes at least an address and a link key (col. 8, ll. 2-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lazzarotto et al. (US 6,782,245) in view of Junod.

8. Claims 11 and 18, Lazzarotto discloses host side wireless interface 600b (Fig. 6) for servicing a computer system having a host computer (not shown) and at least one wireless user input device 608 a-n, the host side wireless interface 600b includes a host side interface 610, a processor unit MPU 606. The host side wireless interface having a host interface also includes a non-volatile memory EEPROM (see Fig. 8B) and wireless

Art Unit: 2182

network interface 805 (Fig. 8A) for interfacing with one of the wireless input device; wherein during a configuration operation, configuration information corresponding to the wireless user input is stored in the non-volatile memory (col. 7, l. 31 to col. 8, l. 28 and col. 9, ll. 12-15) and also transferred to the host computer via the host interface (col. 9, ll. 15-25), wherein during a subsequent boot mode operation, the configuration information is retrieved from the non-volatile memory and used in servicing the user input device (col. 9, ll. 24-26). Lazzarotto does not disclose the configuration information corresponding to the wireless user input is stored in the non-volatile memory and also transferred to the host computer via the host interface wherein during a subsequent boot mode operation, the configuration information is retrieved from the non-volatile memory and used in servicing the user input device.

Junod discloses a system for configuring a communication with a wireless peripheral device wherein during a configuration operation, configuration information corresponding to the wireless user input is stored in the non-volatile memory (col. 8, ll. 24-28, col. 9, ll. 12-15) and also transferred to the host computer via the host interface (col. 9, ll. 15-25), wherein during a subsequent boot mode operation, the configuration information is retrieved from the non-volatile memory and used in servicing the user input device (col. 9, ll. 24-26).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art combine the operating protocol of Junod in the system of Lazzarotto in order to communicate with the wireless input devices since Lazzarotto discloses the apparatus using a communication protocol as disclosed by Junod (US Pat 5,881,336) in order to permit

Art Unit: 2182

multiple wireless devices to communicate with the host system simultaneously using USB to maximize expandability and simplify the connection to the host device (Lazzarotto, col. 2, ll. 28-38 and col. 5, ll. 23-25).

9. Claims 13-15 and 20-22, Lazzarotto discloses the host interface being based on USB interface standard (col. 13, ll. 25-31) and the host side wireless interface operating based on Bluetooth operating standard (col. 12, ll. 60-63) and the wireless input device including one of wireless mouse, keyboard or game controller (abstract).

10. Claims 12, 16, 19 and 23, Lazzarotto discloses the wireless input devices 608 communicating with the host side wireless interface via Bluetooth operating standard, therefore the priority given to the wireless input device being based upon the Remote Name Request (BD_ADDR or AM_ADDR or Class of Device Indication, a generic description of the wireless device) due to the parameters used in the authentication and communication of the host controller interface (HCI) of the Bluetooth technology.

According to the Bluetooth specification, each Bluetooth device is given a remote address (BD_ADDR) and each slave device is assigned an active address (AM_ADDR) when a piconet is formed in order to provide priority within the same piconet or if the AM-ADDR to avoid unauthorized tampering and packet modifying.

11. Claims 15 and 22, Lazzarotto discloses the wireless input device including one of wireless mouse, keyboard or game controller (abstract).

12. Claims 17 and 24, Junod discloses the configuration information including at least an address and a link key (col. 8, ll. 2-18).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. Rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Applicant essentially argued that the term "Bluetooth" is registered in the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office as a Certification Mark to certify characteristics of a person's goods or services, the person being other than its owner of the Certification Mark. Because the Certification Mark is used to identify the source of goods, and not the goods themselves, the scopes of the claims are uncertain.

Applicant also argued that the term "Bluetooth" serves as a nonproprietary name used in trade, and that the term meaning is well known and satisfactorily defined in the literature (see, e.g. Green at claim 10). The arguments are not persuasive because they represent applicant's opinions, not facts. Since Bluetooth is a Certification Mark, it is a proprietary name. Since applicant made reference to Green at claim 10, which refers to Bluetooth as a trademark, Bluetooth is known as a trademark in Green.

Applicant further argued that "at least one version of the Bluetooth operating standard" takes into consideration the backwards-compatibility with respect to the "Bluetooth operating standard" and as permissible, addresses foreseeable alteration of Applicant's claimed structure. The argument is not persuasive because applicant essentially argued that applicant's structure can be changed to a structure not currently disclosed in applicant's invention.

The examiner suggests that applicant amend the claims to describe the characteristics of Bluetooth/USB instead of reciting "one or more versions of the USB interface standard", or "at least one version of the Bluetooth operating standard" - because such limitations, at least, implicitly mean that there is more than one version, and it is not clear which versions are included and which versions are not included, therefore the metes and bounds of the claims are indefinite.

15. Rejections under 35 USC 102

Applicant essentially argued that Junod teaches a unidirectional communications with the host adapter (i.e. not receiving signals back from the host adapter) and does not teach the limitations of the claims.

It is not clear why a unidirectional communications with the host adapter would preclude Junod from teaching the claimed invention, as the Junod teaches all the limitations of the claims - as shown in the rejections above. The argument fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

As best determined by the examiner, it appears that applicant argued that since the wireless input device does not receive signals from the host adapter, the host adapter cannot be used in servicing the wireless input device. Such argument is not persuasive because servicing the wireless input device can reasonably be interpreted as allowing the wireless input device to communicate with the host and the host adapter.

16. Rejections under 35 USC 103

Applicant essentially argued that Junod does not provide a basis for anticipation of independent claims 1, 18, and there is no suggestion to combine with Lazzarotto because Junod teaches a unilateral mouse device. The arguments are not persuasive because Junod teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 18, and the suggestion to combine Lazzarotto with Junod was provided - as shown in the rejections above, and Junod unilateral mouse device does not preclude its use in Lazzarotto's interface.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Quang Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4154 and whose e-mail address is tanh.nguyen36@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh, can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for After Final, Official, and Customer Services, or (571) 273-4154 for Draft to the Examiner (please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Effective May 1, 2003 are new mailing address is:


Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Effective December 1, 2003, hand-carried patent application related incoming correspondences will be to a centralized location.

Art Unit: 2182

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
2011 South Clark Place
Customer Window
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.



04/17/2006